

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

The Final Office Action mailed December 13, 2007 has been carefully considered. Reconsideration in view of the following remarks is respectfully requested.

Claims 1, 30, 55 have been amended to further particularly point out and distinctly claim subject matter regarded as the invention. Support for these changes may be found in the specification in paragraph [0100].

The 35 U.S.C. § 103 Rejection

Claims 1-11, 13-15, 30-44 and 55-69 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being allegedly unpatentable over Walker et al. (USP 6,110,041) in view of Walker et al. (USP 6,077,163) and Microsoft®Windows®95 (Windows), among which claims 1, 30 and 55 are independent claims. This rejection is respectfully traversed.

The Office Action states that the “rejection in the previous office action dated 03/27/2007 is maintained and incorporated herein.” Applicants respectfully disagree for the reasons, among others discussed below.

The Examiner cites to Walker ‘041 as teaching “the simulation of selected game elements and the simulation of playing the selected game which inherently does not require a wager since it is only a simulation of the game in 6:30-40”. However, Walker ‘041 simply teaches “simulated representations of objects contained in the selected game ... preferably animated or displayed to simulate playing of the selected game.” (Col. 6, lines 32-38). However, the simulation does not consider the different game feature settings selected from a player. Walker ‘041 does not teach or suggest a “simulated game presentation is for allowing a user to determine the effects of different game feature settings on the game presentation for the game of chance prior to initiating the wagering game play on the gaming machine wherein the wager is not required to view the simulated game presentation.” Nor does Walker ‘041 describe any need to determine the effects of different game feature settings on the game presentation prior to initiating wagering game play on the gaming machine.

The Office Action cites the Windows reference to overcome the deficiency of the Walker references. However, Windows does not mention or suggest in any manner a simulated game presentation of an entire game of chance, game presentations of any type, wagering game play of any type or determining the effects of game feature settings prior to initiating wager game play. The Windows reference does not perform any simulation of any kind, much less a simulated game play of an entire game of chance.

However, in the interest of furthering prosecution, Claim 1 has been amended to provide for the features of “wherein the master gaming controller automatically updates the user’s preference account information based upon the user’s playing characteristics as the user plays the wagering play game on the gaming machine.” Amended Claims 30 and 55 have a similar feature. This is further supported in the specification, which states:

In 630, player preference account data may be updated. For instance, during a game play session on the gaming machine where a player plays a series of games, preference account software on the gaming machine may record one or more characteristics of the player’s game play during the game play session such as the amount wagered on each game or the speed at which the player plays a game. The characteristics may be used to update preference account information for the player. For example, the rate at which a player plays the game may be used to adjust a game presentation speed on the gaming machine stored in a player’s preference account. Thus, the update of the preference account information may occur without a direct input by the player.

(Specification, [0100]). The combination of prior art references does not teach the elements.

Accordingly, since the combination of prior art references do not teach each and every single element and the combination does not result in the claimed invention, it can not be said to render the claimed invention obvious. As to dependent claims 2-11, 13-15, 31-44 and 56-69, the argument set forth above is equally applicable here. The base claims being allowable, the dependent claims must also be allowable. It is respectfully requested that this rejection be withdrawn.

In view of the foregoing, it is respectfully asserted that the claims are now in condition for allowance. It is respectfully requested that this rejection be withdrawn.

Conclusion

It is believed that this Amendment places the above-identified patent application into condition for allowance. Early favorable consideration of this Amendment is earnestly solicited and Applicant respectfully requests that a timely Notice of Allowance be issued in this case. If, in the opinion of the Examiner, an interview would expedite the prosecution of this application, the Examiner is invited to call the undersigned attorney at the number indicated below.

Applicant hereby petitions for an extension of time which may be required to maintain the pendency of this case, and any required fee for such extension or any further fee required in connection with the filing of this Amendment is to be charged to Deposit Account No. 504481(Order No. IGT1P026).

Respectfully submitted,
BEYER LAW GROUP LLP

/Adrienne Yeung/
Adrienne Yeung
Registration No. 44,000

P.O. Box 1687
Cupertino, CA 95015-1687
(408) 255-8001